

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD - DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE 1013TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY APRIL 14, 2021 AT 8:35 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:31 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Ricks, AIA, Chair Registered Architect (left at 9:15AM)
 Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Vice-Chair Registered Architect (Chaired meeting)
 Martha Blakey Smith, AIA Registered Architect
 Ilyas Bhatti, P.E. Registered Engineer
 Rebecca Sherer, P.E. Registered Engineer
 Kenneth Wexler General Contractor
 Janice Bergeron Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:
 Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP Registered Architect
 Daniel M. Carson, P.E. Registered Engineer
 David A. Chappell, P.E. Registered Engineer

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1012th March 31, 2021 meeting was made by Ilyas Bhatti seconded by Rebecca Sherer. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Rodney Jacques	William Starck Architects, Inc.
Geoff Northrup	William Starck Architects, Inc.
Jason Kruckas	DCAMM
James Latini	DCAMM
Jeffrey Dill	DCAMM
Jessica Brown	EDM
Michael Coppola	Liro
Steven Medeiros	Civitects
Martin Vickey	Crowley Engineering
Nancy Banks	B2Q
Cheryl Buttler	F-T
Sharmila Bail	Shekar
Caitlin Daniels	CBI
Crystale Wozniak	Kleinfelder
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Laura Petreszyn	CHA Companies
Miles McDonald	BVH
Deanne McGuinness	McGuinness Group
Rebecca Maloney	RFS Engineering
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Ashley Solomon	Dietz Architects
Debbie Yelle	Kleinfelder
Lisa Ferolito	Charter
Brianna Sullivan	William Sloan
Jeffrey DeVeau	STV
Chris Nordberg	STV
Diane Donaghey	NV5
Conrad Hertz	RMF
Abdullah Khaliqi	F-T
Christina Silvestro	Liro
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Simone Brogini	Kleinfelder
Mitch DeWein	CHA Companies
Brian Novelline	Liro
Laura Woodman	RMF
Arleen Guyan	Crowley Engineering
Ashley Horan	TSKP
Stephanie Cronin	Middlesex3
Mike Sears	NV5

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Informational Interview

Rodney Jacques and Geoff Northrup both from William Starck Architects, Inc. met with the Board to discuss their firms' experience and the Designer Selection Board process.

B. DSB List #21-05, #DCP2139AD1, Study and Design for Architectural Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM, Statewide, Fee: \$500,000 (House Doctor), 21 Applications

Representing DCAMM were Jeffrey Dill, Jason Kruckas and James Latini to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following twenty-one (21) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary of discussion:

Amenta Emma Architects – They had a strong application. The responses to the evaluation were specific and the diversity matrix in Section #5 showed the shared experience of the team members.

Caolo & Bieniek Associates – This was a good application and they are qualified to perform the tasks requested in the advertisement. They had a good diversity statement.

CBI Consulting, LLC – They provided good references. This was an excellent application with relevant work experience.

Civitects, PC – The prime has shown mostly school experience but did have a diversified team of consultants with broader experience. They provided several positive references. This application is not as strong as some of the other firms.

DHK Architects – They provided a strong diversity statement. Their evaluations were strong. The resumes were not informative and did not provide any reference in the resumes to their in-house specification and code consultant.

Dietz & Company Architects, Inc. – They have provided good references and a strong, diverse team. This was a good application. Section #5 thoughtfully responded to the criteria requested in the advertisement. They have several “house doctor” experiences.

Dyer Brown & Associates, Inc. – They presented strong client references. The diversity statement was good. They did not present small project experience but do have the capability to perform them.

EDM Services, Inc. – They provided a nice chart in response to the project criteria. Their response to sustainability experience was a little weak. They have the experience but should have given more detail in Section #5.

Edward Rowse Architects, Inc. – The resumes and prime experience seem to be a catalog of work experience and not much detail on their projects. Section #5 was not as strong as other applicants.

Habeeb and Associates Architects – This was a strong application with good qualifications. They provided good agency evaluations. Their resumes were tailored to the criteria requested in the advertisement. Section #5 was very strong.

ICON Architecture – They provided a good diverse team with excellent references. The resumes for the prime firm could have provided more detail. The chart submitted was hard to read and should have been more defined.

Kleinfelder Northeast, Inc. – This is a large firm with a Boston office. They have good evaluations. This firm does not fit the description of smaller firms that DCAMM requested. They had a good Section #5.

LLB Architects – The resumes show relevant project experience but should have provided more detail. They provided good references.

McGuinness Group – They provided excellent client references. This application was hard to navigate. Section #5 was not as strong as other applicants.

Overunder – This was a good application and improved from their previous applications submitted. The prime experience was primarily private clients and mostly planning projects.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects, PC – This firm provided excellent client references. The MBE is stronger than the WBE participation. Section #5 was good and addressed the criteria.

RGB Architects – They provided a good response to all the criteria except for the sustainability. They have the relevant experience for this project.

STV, Inc. – This was a very strong application. They have experience working with DCAMM. The diversity statement provided was good.

Touloukian Touloukian, Inc. – This is a newer firm. They provided excellent client references. They have relevant house doctor experience. Section #5 met all the requirements in the criteria.

William Sloan Associates – They provided relevant experience for the prime and subconsultants. Section #5 was good.

Winslow Architects – This is a new firm. Most of the demonstrated experience was for housing. This was not a strong application and did not reflect the requirements in the criteria.

C. Public Comments

No public comment

D. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this “house doctor” project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked firms:

Habeeb and Associates Architects
STV, Inc.
Touloukian Touloukian, Inc.

Motion was made by Rebecca Sherer to select the three unranked finalists mentioned above for the DCAMM Architectural “House Doctor” project, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

The immediate services authorized are certifiable building study, schematic plans and outline specifications, design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract.

The Maximum Fee per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed \$500,000.

E. DSB List #21-06, #DCP2138AD1, Study and Design for Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM, Statewide, Fee: \$500,000 (House Doctor), 23 Applications

Representing DCAMM were Jeffrey Dill, Jason Kruckas and James Latini to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following twenty-three (23) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

AKAL Engineering, Inc. – They did not respond to the criteria requested in the advertisement. There were some elements that were done well but Section #5 was not strong.

Arora Engineers, Inc. – The prime experience was focused on Massport and MBTA experience. Their subconsultant team covered the DCAMM experience. Section #5 was not as strong as other applicants.

B2Q Associates, Inc. – They provided strong client references. This was a good application with relevant experience. The resumes showed an experience chart with good detail.

BLW Engineers, Inc. – The prime and other team member resumes could have shown more detail. Section #5 was responsive and showed relevant experience.

BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – They provided good references. This was a good application. The resumes were responsive, and Section #5 was nicely done. The diversity statement was good.

C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc. – They have good references. The resumes were detailed and have relevant DCAMM experience. They named Habeeb as the architect who was selected as an architectural house doctor. This was a good application.

Clough Harbour and Associates, LLP – This application was confusing to navigate. The response to the criteria does explain how they will use the alternate firms listed. They do have the relevant experience.

Consulting Engineering Services, LLC – They have relevant experience with DCAMM. Section #5 provided all the criteria requested in the advertisement.

DiGiorgio Associates, Inc. – This was a confusing application. They provided a strong client reference.

Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc. – They provided excellent references. This was a strong application. They provided in-house specification and code expertise which is well described in their resumes. Section #5 was strong and well detailed.

Garcia, Galuska, DeSousa, Inc. – Their MBE and WBE was not strong. This application was hard to navigate.

Hesnor Engineering Associates, PLLC – This is a smaller engineering firm with excellent relevant experience. They addressed all the criteria in Section #5.

Norian Siani Engineering, Inc. – They have experience with DHCD house doctor projects. Their references are good. This application was difficult to navigate, and Section #5 was not as strong as other applicants.

Pristine Engineers, Inc. – They presented good client references. This was a good application with a strong response to Section #5.

R.W. Sullivan Engineering – They have excellent references. They provided in-house code consulting which was mentioned in their resume. They have relevant experience but did not respond thoroughly to Section #5.

RDK Engineers/NV5 – They provided relevant DCAMM experience. The client references are good. Section #5 was strong. This was a good application.

Rist-Frost-Shumway Engineering, PC – Some of the evaluations were good but it would have been nice to see the dates of the evaluations so the Board could see the improvement of the firm. Section #5 had a good response to the criteria in the advertisement.

RMF Engineering, Inc. – They provided a strong response to the project criteria in Section #5. They have the relevant experience for this project.

Shekar and Associates, Inc. – They have good evaluations and client references. Section #5 had good response. This was a strong application.

SMRT Architects and Engineers – Their response to Section #5 was good with a nice diversity statement. They have the relevant experience for this house doctor project.

STV, Inc.- This was a strong application. They have relevant house doctor experience.

VAV International, Inc. – They have relevant project experience. Their Section #5 answered all the criteria requested in the advertisement. This was a strong application.

WSP USA – They provided good client references. They have qualified relevant experience. Section #5 responded to the criteria in the advertisement.

F. Public Comments

No public comment

G. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this “house doctor” project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted to select the following six (6) unranked firms:

B2Q Associates, Inc.
BVH Integrated Services, P.C.
Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc.
Hesnor Engineering Associates, PLLC
RDK/NV5
VAV International, Inc

Motion was made by Rebecca Sherer to select the six unranked finalists mentioned above for the DCAMM MEP “House Doctor” project, seconded by Kenneth Wexler. Motion was approved.

The immediate services authorized are certifiable building study, schematic plans and outline specifications, design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract.

The Maximum Fee per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed \$500,000.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:32 AM

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of April 14, 2021 by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021 at 8:30 AM via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: A. Ricker